

REMARKS

Claim 15 has been amended. Claims 6-20 remain for consideration. No new matter has been added.

The Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended in granting a telephone interview on July 25, 2006 to discuss this matter. Attorney Kosakowski and Examiner Bui discussed the prior art and its application to the independent claims. No agreement was reached.

The objections and rejections shall be taken up in the order presented in the Official Action.

1-4. Claims 6-19 currently stand rejected for allegedly being obvious over the subject matter disclosed in U.S. Patent 6,611,537 to Edens *et al.* (hereinafter “Edens”).

Claim 6

Claim 6 recites a motor vehicle optical ring network. It is respectfully submitted that the Official Action improperly construes Edens and improperly reads elements of Edens onto the claimed invention to allege that Edens renders the claimed invention obvious.

With respect to claim 6, the Official Action contends that the CD/DVD player or multimedia PC of Fig. 1 in Edens reads on the claimed feature of a playback transducer (see Official Action, pg. 3). The Official Action further alleges that “..., i.e., a multimedia PC 170 can be functioned as a controller in controlling devices to adapt to transmit and receive digital media to/and from other network devices according to formats, types or protocols” (Official Action, pg. 3). However, construing Edens such that the multimedia PC allegedly reads on both the claimed playback transducer and the controller fails to properly consider the claimed invention as whole. Specifically, as recited in claim 6 the controller is an element of the data sink. Claim 6 recites that the data sink

provides a decompressed data signal to the playback device. The construction of Edens in the Official Action, or any fair and proper construction of Edens, is incapable of reading on claim 6 since the construction set forth in the Official Action construes that the multimedia PC would provide the compressed data to itself for playback, since that the Official Action alleges that the multimedia PC reads on both the playback transducer and the controller. However, such a construction is clearly not the claimed invention. Significantly, claim 6 recites the data sink includes “...*a bit stream decoder to decompress the received compressed data and provide a decompressed data signal indicative thereof to the playback transducer via the optical data line;*” (emphasis added, cl. 6). Claim 6 further recites that the data sink includes both a data stream decoder and a control unit. The Official Action alleges that the multimedia PC reads on both the playback device and the control unit. However, such a contention is improper since construing the multimedia PC of Edens in this manner makes it impossible for Edens to satisfy the claimed feature of “...*a bit stream decoder to decompress the received compressed data and provide a decompressed data signal indicative thereof to the playback transducer via the optical data line;*” (cl. 6) since the multimedia PC is a single device that does not include functional components connected together via an optical data line. As recited in claim 6, the data sink and the playback transducer are separate devices connected together via the optical data line. The Official Action is impermissibly reading the multimedia PC of Eden onto two separate components of the claimed invention that are connected together by the optical data line as recited in claim 6. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the Edens is incapable of rendering obvious the network of claim 6.

Claim 15

Amended claim 15 recites an optical ring network for use in a motor vehicle. It is

respectfully submitted that amended claim 15 is patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 6.

Claim 20

Claim 20 was added in an Amendment mailed to the PTO on June 20, 2006. While the current Official Action on PTO form PTOL-326 indicates that claim 20 currently stands rejected, the current Official Action lacks any explicit arguments regarding the rejection. Nevertheless, in the telephone interview of July 25, 2006 noted above, the Examiner indicated that claim 20 currently stands rejected for the same reasoning as claim 6. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claim 20 is patentable for at least the same reasons as claims 6 and 15.

For all the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of claims 6-20 is respectfully requested.

If a telephone interview could assist in the prosecution of this application, please call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Patrick J. O'Shea
Registration No. 35,305
O'Shea, Getz & Kosakowski, P.C.
1500 Main Street, Suite 912
Springfield, Massachusetts 01115
Telephone: (413) 731-3100, x102